

Critical Discourse Analysis of a Reading Text 'Pakistan and the Modern World': A Speech by Liaquat Ali Khan

Sheeraz Ali¹, Bahram Kazemian²

¹Institute of English Language and Literature, University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan

²Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

Email address:

alisheeraz77@gmail.com (S. Ali), bahram_kazemian@yahoo.com (B. Kazemian)

To cite this article:

Sheeraz Ali, Bahram Kazemian. Critical Discourse Analysis of a Reading Text 'Pakistan and the Modern World': A Speech by Liaquat Ali Khan. *Communication and Linguistics Studies*. Vol. 1, No. 3, 2015, pp. 35-41. doi: 10.11648/j.cls.20150103.11

Abstract: This paper presents some key concepts in studying and analyzing the aspects of communication critically. It has always been crucial and a complex phenomenon for the experts in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to decode and deduce the meaning of a text through context. They examine and attribute language as a social process involving context to determine the meaning of an utterance to its producer and receiver. It has also been of great interest and enthusiasm for discourse analysts to explore and identify the underlying objective of meaning carrying an ideological message based on religious, sociopolitical, and historical assumptions. The discourse practitioners are seriously occupied with critical studies on revealing social inequality, power relations, and dominance operated through language (Wodak, 2001a). Critical studies have actively pursued such discursive practices of power dominance, the imposition of an ideology, and discrimination through text and talk. There have been important insights on sociopolitical and historical discourse serving the purpose at (macro and micro) levels of analysis (van Dijk, 1993). It suggests the use of conversation analysis, narrative analysis, rhetoric/stylistics, and media analysis. The underlying approach may be used to analyze the discourse of speeches delivered by renowned politicians, parliamentarians, and national leaders. Following van Dijk (1993) approach/model, this study aims to analyze a political speech, titled as 'Pakistan and the Modern World' made by the first Prime Minister of Pakistan Liaquat Ali Khan at the University of Kansas, United States of America.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, Paradigm, Social Interaction, Context, Text, Discourse, Social Cognition, Ideology, Power Dominance, Speech, Kansas, America

1. Introduction

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is relatively an emerging paradigm in the field of linguistics and language studies. It aims to investigate multiple functions of communication at all levels of social interaction. The origin of Discourse Analysis can be traced back to the critical theory of Frankfurt in the 1970s. Its fundamental implications were based on the idea of developing a critical attitude towards society. One of the key concepts of critical approach is to study and investigate mental modes of representing knowledge, attitude, and cultural ideologies (van Dijk, 1993). In fact, the term 'social cognition' is a real depiction of mind embodying said assumptions that ultimately produce discursive practices of power dominance, inequality, and discrimination in society (p.257).

The role of a discourse analyst in the domain of communication is to investigate and expose sociocultural and

political problems of a particular community. It is under the study of discourse practitioners to ascertain what strategies of interaction significantly promote biased culture in the mode of imposition and acceptance. It can be assumed at a simple level of interaction implying speech acts such as commands or orders for the enactment of power dominance through text and talk. The underlying critical approach deeply emphasizes on those discursive practices involved in establishing inequality through power dominance in society (van Dijk, 1993).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) attempts to uncover hidden meaning and message of a text which certainly has an intention for its receivers. However, the language users make a choice of certain lexical items, structures, and style for shaping discourse to convince the audience at social and institutional level. This output may either be ideologically or politically driven by the speakers' cognitive assumption about the world (Fowler et al., 1979, p. 188).

van Dijk (1993), on the other hand, argues that Critical

Discourse Analysis is an expository perspective on various types of analysis taking a firm stance against sociocultural issues produced through language. Unlike linguistic analysis, it studies verbal and nonverbal shifts of language forming discourse with a specific focus on conveying meaning or message. By asserting diverse areas of critical analysis, van Dijk's assertions mainly focus on those texts producing power dominance, discrimination, and imposition in society (1998, p.35).

In such diverse areas, the role of CDA is to create explicit awareness regarding the use of language in society. The chief characteristics of a critical language study are based on the analysis of urgent issues of a contemporary society manipulated through the textual representation of a secret agenda. In order to ascertain such hidden assertions, it becomes mandatory to apply critical strategies to any form of discourse aiming to expose any wrong agenda. The most influential aspect of language studies is to analyze knowledge-based or persuasive discourse because of its potentiality in influencing the public at large (van Dijk, 1998).

In this connection, this paper attempts to analyze a political speech selected from an Intermediate English Book II, titled as Reading Text: 'Pakistan and the Modern World' delivered by the first Prime Minister of Pakistan Liaquat Ali Khan at Kansas University, United States of America.

'Pakistan and the Modern World' is the text of a speech delivered by Liaquat Ali Khan on the acknowledgements of an honorary degree conferred upon him by the University of Kansas, United States of America in 1950. He continued a series of eloquent speeches made under the influence of Islamic Nationalism aiming to unite the Muslims of the subcontinent. Being a politician, statesman, and a lawyer, he invoked his voice eloquently regarding the creation of Pakistan as a separate Muslim entity.

It was one of those speeches emphasizing the causes of a political movement which ultimately led to the creation of an Islamic state. By representing Pakistan as an emerging state, Liaquat Ali Khan pays attribute to the people of America on account of their growing interest in the affairs of the world. He draws a close connection between America and Pakistan in terms of practicing democracy and freedom as new norms in earlier days. Being a Muslim, he strongly supports the idea of an independent state for one hundred million people living in united India. However, there was a time when both the communities, i.e. (Hindus and Muslims) had lived together for more than one thousand years.

According to Liaquat Ali Khan, the partition was not merely a matter of religious controversy, but there had been sociocultural and economical differences forcing the Muslims to strive for an independent state. They soon, after the end of British rule, realized an overwhelming sense of insecurity from Hindus domination on account of their majority in the subcontinent. The Muslims on their part considered it as a major threat and setback to their religious culture and civilization living in united India. Therefore, parting India was accepted as a resolution to the issue of religious controversy between Hindus and Muslims.

Finally, the speech contains assertions on declaring South Asia as an unprivileged part of the world. Most of its countries greatly suffer from hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance, anarchy and social unrest. Pakistan as an independent state firmly believes in ideals of democracy, progress, prosperity, technological development, and scientific growth. At the time of partition, Pakistan also came across many challenges in managing the economical, administrative, industrial, and political affairs of the state. Its industry, economy, and agriculture were mainly received in deteriorating conditions. Therefore, the support from West is imperative to develop Pakistan in the larger interest of maintaining democracy, freedom, and world peace.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Theoretical Framework

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has tremendously attracted a considerable amount of attention of the researchers and linguists in the field of language studies. The emergence of critical approach in the 1970s inspired a large number of experts and professionals regarding the use of language in a sociocultural and political context. It has also actively pursued all forms of social interaction carrying an inward message or an underlying meaning through text and talk. There are diverse dimensions of investigating discourse attempting to reveal any hidden agenda in relation to the individuals of a particular group or society (Kazemian & Hashemi, 2014b).

van Dijk essentially draws attention on asserting discourse as a matter of mental representation of ideas, attitudes, beliefs, values and overall expression of an ideology. Such an abstract depiction of mind is called personal and social cognition because of participants' interaction and sharing of knowledge through communication. van Dijk emphasizes the role of context in shaping, framing, organizing, and determining the appropriate meaning of discourse. Its underlying objective in the construction of an ideology is completely based on sociocultural and political context. A large number of such political and rhetorical discourses have implications on producing wrong agenda to influence their audience (1993, p. 257).

2.2. Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive Model

According to van Dijk's (1993, 1998) socio-cognitive model, there are intricate relationships between power dominance, inequality, racism, and the imposition of an ideology through an underlying process of language production. The fundamental aim of studying these intricacies is to investigate what strategies and aspects of communication produce biased culture in society. Particularly, there are underlying texts containing power structures in the mode of legalizing and justifying the act of dominance at various levels of interaction. However, this has often been observed with the people not only having control over discourse but also exercising power at a social and institutional level (1993, p. 250).

2.3. Fairclough's Critical Approach

Fairclough, on the other hand, declares language as a social process implying linguistic and nonlinguistic characteristics of a society. His major study on Language and Power (1989) known as a critical approach was mainly inspired by Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) (1994). It aims at raising awareness on account of prevailing negligence on the role of language in creating, establishing and changing the social relations of power. This theoretical aspect of Fairclough's approach suggests ways of analyzing language through cultural characteristics embodying identities, interactions, knowledge, and belief system.

Fairclough (1989) not only considers language as a social and meaningful process but also differentiates text from discourse on verbal and nonverbal grounds. The term discourse not merely implies text, interaction, and social context but also refers to a complete process of social interaction. Besides this, there is the underlying phenomenon of social conditions which ultimately leads towards the process of text production and interpretation. All of these aspects contribute discourse, but the analysts are mainly interested in investigating those features of text affecting participants and events.

The origins of Fairclough's critical approach are absolute in the background of sociolinguistics having expertise in the study of language in social context. There are meaningful insights on language power relations providing proofs of linguistic imperialism by an influential class of society. Similarly, there are a number of critical studies concerned with the exercise of power through conversation. The explanation and description of such power relations are apart from sociolinguistics due to the existing cultural conventions. However, Fairclough attempts to explain them on account of maintaining a close connection between power and ideology.

2.4. Wodak's Historical Model

Another expert, Ruth Wodak, chooses sociological and historical model for the studies in Critical Discourse Analysis. The chief characteristics of the approach are mainly based on Frankfurt school of sociolinguistics. Wodak's earlier studies were particularly modeled upon institutional discourse intricacies in courtrooms, schools, and hospitals. Recently, she has been occupied with an intensive work on sexism, anti-Semitism, and racism. In pursuing critical studies, there are practical implications and guidelines regarding the appropriate use of language in certain situations such as patient-doctor, student-teacher, and client-advocate communications. This is the most distinctive aspect of the historical approach to analyze communication on the basis of background information (2001b, pp. 69-70).

Applying the historical approach to discourse is in a way considering language as a form of social behaviour, making hardly any differences between Fairclough and Wodak regarding the dialectic connection between discourse acts and focused areas of action, such as situations, institutional frameworks, and social structures. On the contrary, Wodak

differentiates discourse from text on account of social acts. She defines discourse as an intricate set of compact and coherent language patterns emerging from the genre of text.

Historically, this approach is a sort of interdisciplinary model for practicing CDA. It deeply acknowledges the intricacy of an underlying phenomenon between language and society. This methodology incorporates argumentation theory based on Halliday's Functional Linguistics to focus on specific language issues. Therefore, the analysts may find it useful for practicing discourse on account of employing historical perspective of the language.

In van Dijk's socio-cognitive model, context is categorized in terms of macro and micro level of analysis. Defining it implies the notion of historical, cultural, political, and social structure of a communicative event, whereas micro context primarily serves the purpose of representing an immediate situation, interaction of a communicative event. It has essentially been driven on the basis of cognition operating through the mental modes of communication. In fact, these models concentrate on the important features of text production and comprehensions, such as genre, cohesion, coherence, style, imagery, speech acts, and the choice of topic.

van Dijk (1993) affirms that these mentioned models are permanently stored in the long-term memory of a human mind. These abstract representations function in the mode of previously acquired knowledge on the basis of experiencing the world phenomenon. These explain and interpret a communicative event producing discourse on account of participants' underlying belief system, and the experience of world phenomenon. In fact, the mental modes are imperative for forming a coherent connection between society and discourse. Otherwise, it would have been an isolated and meaningless phenomenon for the individuals of an underlying society, and culture.

Hence, the fundamental objective of pursuing critical discourse studies is to examine and investigate communication through sociocultural context. Wodak (2001a) also employs this term interchangeably (socially and historically) to expose social inequality and power dominance in society. Fairclough also realizes that CDA is not only an explanatory mode of interpreting and analyzing language, but rather a practical tool of resistance against existing discrimination and injustice in society. van Dijk also believes that CDA is not merely an approach or a specific direction but manipulation of language critically. To conclude it as a whole, this approach is an exploratory mode of discovering and resisting power dominance, social inequality, and the imposition of an ideology.

There are a number of significant research studies on CDA and SFG aiming to interpret and investigate the meaning of speech texts delivered by renowned politicians, mass leaders, and parliamentarians (Choi, 2006; Pu, 2007; Rashidi & Souzandehfar, 2010; Wang, 2010; Kazemian et al., 2013; Behnam & Kazemian, 2013; Kazemian & Hashemi, 2014a, b; Ehineni, 2014; Zheng, 2014; Noor et al., 2015; Kasemian & Hashemi, 2015). These speech texts are often found notorious on account of manipulating language for the specific material

gains. Generally, these utterances influence and misguide an ordinary man due to an extensive amount of persuasive dialogues. Therefore, CDA attempts to unravel the hidden or secret meaning behind these speeches (Johnstone, 2002).

Critical and meaningful insights from various approaches/models to CDA commonly pursue an ultimate objective of exploring sociocultural and political issues expressed through language. The multiplicity and intricacy of communication are based on its relation to the participants and subsequent issues of power dominance, ideology, inequality, and racism in society. The analysts continue to awaken people by making a critical contribution against sociocultural and political discrimination of a contemporary society. It is, therefore, imperative to understand that language is a powerless phenomenon until and unless it drives force from its speakers.

3. Data Analysis

3.1. CDA of a Speech Text

Applying CDA to any form of text is somewhat investigating the hidden meaning of words used in context. This analysis is concerned with a speech text selected from Intermediate English Book II prescribed for second-year college students. It is fundamentally a political transcript of a speech titled as Pakistan and the Modern World made by Liaquat Ali Khan at the University of Kansas, United States of America. Following van Dijk's socio-cognitive model, the analysis attempts to highlight specific areas of text, context, genre, meaning, style, and coherence.

3.2. Access to Discourse

According to van Dijk (1993), access is defined as a special kind of privilege or recourse to a discourse, genre or style used by a speaker in a particular context. This speech text is a selected example of a political discourse/genre used by Liaquat Ali Khan at the University of Kansas, United States of America. He uses political discourse as a first Prime Minister of a newly created state addressing the audience on the conferment of an honorary upon himself. This dominant position and access to discourse not only reveals the importance of his personality but also shows the enactment of power dominance through language.

3.3. Setting and Context

This political speech was delivered by Liaquat Ali Khan on the occasion of a degree awarding ceremony at the University of Kansas. He addresses the people of America on account of representing Pakistan as a newly created state of South Asia. The most influential aspect of his speech is the comparison of Pakistan with the modern states of the world. It also includes an underlying justification regarding the separation of India into two states for the Muslims of the subcontinent. There are underlying causes on the part of Muslims to struggle for an independent state based on a religious ideology. The most fragments of the speech text are served to attack opponents as

a religious controversy between two communities. Finally, the event, speech, and location are implied notions of power relations in the context of critical language study.

3.4. Genre

To van Dijk (1993, 1998), genre is a kind of specific linguistic style uttered by a speaker on the basis of sociocultural conventions of a society. This speech text employs a political discourse to manifest Pakistan as an independent state. It represents a sociopolitical and religious controversy led by the Muslims on account of the differences between Hinduism and Islam. The Muslims' leader Liaquat Ali Khan delivers the speech by using political discourse and style to convince the audience at Kansas. Being a Prime Minister, he uses this genre on account of his prominent position in the affairs of the state. As a discursive practice of power, Liaquat Ali Khan not only controls discourse but also exercises power through the speech and discourse. This sort of privilege is not merely a matter of everyday talk or conversation but implies the highest level of political decision making.

3.5. Communicative Acts and Social Meaning

Apart from power dominance and ideology, this speech is selected from an institutional context implying social and interactional meaning in the following utterances. Its introductory part briefly indicates politeness, gratitude, and mutual respect.

- You have been kind enough to select me as the recipient of your recognition, in order to do honor to my country rather than reward me for my inadequate merits.
- That in expressing gratitude for your generosity, my country more than myself should speak to you on this occasion.

These quoted lines contain communicative acts of honor, intimacy, and the modes of the formal address conveyed through the words, i.e., (kind, recognition, honor, reward, inadequate merits, gratitude, and generosity), but the social power relations seem to be unequal on account of sociocultural and scientific empowerment of the United States of America. In fact, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan controls much of the discourse as a Prime Minister but the status quo of the host attaches importance to the event and the audience.

More interesting is the move at the socio-semantic level causing the speaker to acknowledge the efforts of America for its interest in the affairs of the world. He admits an undeniable fact that the emerging states like Pakistan are looking forward to West for their progress and prosperity in the field of science and technology. Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan severely attacks his opponents mentioned as (Hindus or Non-Muslims) because of his present position as a Muslim Prime Minister. He adds a considerable amount of favor to defend the cause of Muslims as a religious and political controversy over splitting India into two states. The speaker seems surprisingly interested in idealizing Islam as one of the sacred religions of the world.

Despite the choice of topic (Pakistan and the Modern

World), Liaquat Ali Khan persistently makes assertions on religious differences instead of comparing Pakistan with the modern world. This rather shows the imposition of a religious ideology on the part of a political leader representing his people and culture to an advanced and democratic state of the world. On the contrary, this speech mainly emphasizes on a religious conflict rather than the ideals of democracy as claimed by the speaker in the following lines:

- Pakistan is a new state; or to be more exact, a new democracy. As a democracy it is not yet three years old. There was a time when your country, where the traditions of civil liberty, freedom and democracy have not taken such firm roots.....
- There lived a hundred million Muslims who for centuries had made this part of the world their homeland. They lived side by side with three hundred million others—mostly Hindus who had come to this continent in an earlier era.
- Long experience and the history of several centuries had taught them that under a dominating majority of three to one, freedom from British rule would mean to the Muslims not freedom but merely a change of masters.

In view of the speaker, the terms democracy and freedom are asserted in terms of practicing and protecting religious belief and culture. The underlying differences mentioned in the speech are not only portraying the wrong picture of cultural uniformity between two communities but also differentiate them on religious grounds. It was, in fact, the history of several centuries' witnessing the two communities lived together for more than one thousand years during Muslim rule in the subcontinent. By misquoting the history, the speaker states that the Muslims are under cultural threat due to their perpetual minority in India. Therefore, the ideals of democracy, such as freedom and liberty are only manifested in the speech for the enactment of power dominance in the discourse.

3.6. Participant Positions and Roles

This speech text reveals participant roles and positions drawn from the multiple utterances made before the audience. He (Liaquat Ali Khan) obviously addresses himself as the Prime Minister and a representative of Muslim League. These positions demand him to put forward the case of Pakistan on an international agenda level. Hence, it is not only his role as a Prime Minister that influences the formal characteristics of his speech, but also his identity as a Muslim representative of his country. Both of these positions provide potential proofs of an underlying criticism fabricated against Hindu opponents. His main concern over religious identity is far deeper than democracy, liberty, and freedom of the speech. Therefore, the aggression against opponents proves nothing but a culturally biased approach as indicated in the following lines from the speech text.

- The Muslims were numerous enough to constitute a nation bigger than most nations in the world and in South Asia there were large enough areas where they were in majority.

- We believed then and we believe now that the demand of the Muslims in British India to have a separate state of their own was, both on human and geo-political grounds, a very reasonable demand. To millions of the Muslims it meant to only opportunity.

3.7. Speech Acts

Van Dijk (1998) contends that speech acts are defined as implied intentions of an utterance or utterances produced by the speaker in the text. This speech text contains such acts or moves on the basis of various assertions at macro-semantic level. The speaker signifies deep intentions of aggression, criticism, and partial comparison between Hinduism and Islam. However, some of the speech acts represent sociocultural differences as mentioned below.

- The Muslims were monotheists, the Hindus were polytheists, or that the Muslims believed in the prophet of Arabia and in Christ and the prophets of the Old Testament, whereas the Hindus did not.....
- The Hindus believed in a caste system, which made it a sin for those at the top of the hierarchy to eat with the so-called lower human beings or in some cases even to touch them ... Their economic outlooks were also very different.

Following the speech acts presented to differentiate the Muslims and Hindus, such as monotheist and polytheist, and the differences in belief do not really justify the point of view to divide India. There were such differences when Muslims invaded, ruled, and dominated in the past. The time has proved that the two nation theory to demand separation was wrongly based. Now, it would be more appropriate to mention a multinational state.

In the light of historical facts, the past imperialism of Rome and caliphate under theological influence spread the faith. The Romans converted Europe into Christianity and Muslims to Islamize conquered territories, therefore, a large number of populations of Hindustan under dominant Muslim rule was converted to create division. By the time when Hindustan got rid of the foreign rule, it was divided into two faiths one converted Muslims and the other ancient faith of forefathers. More than two hundred million converted Muslims still live in secular India which proves speaker's fears wrong.

Liaquat Ali Khan's leveled allegations explicitly justify one point agenda of defending and protecting Muslims against Hindus. Many of these assertions wrongly depict the picture of sociocultural traditions of a prevalent society of that time. It is therefore clear from the critical perspective that the speech participant largely exposes his effectiveness of authority in the imposition of a religious ideology.

3.8. Macro-semantic Topic

Pakistan and the Modern World is the topic of this speech text justifying the creation of a separate state on the basis of a religious ideology. It may be interpreted in various ways at the macro-semantic level, such as the comparison of Pakistan with the Western World or Pakistan as an emerging state or

democracy of South Asia. The topic also implies sociocultural and political meaning regarding the manipulation of speech text on racial and ethnic grounds, for instance, Pakistan as a Muslim state or to be more exact a religious state. However, the speech text touches upon the ideals of democracy in a sociopolitical and religious perspective.

The underlying fragment of this speech text reveals how power dominance is exercised or enacted through an event of a political discourse. One of the major functions of such discourse is to represent dominant ideologies:

- From the point of view of world peace the creation of two independent and comparatively homogenous states instead of a single uneasy and unwieldy state with great strains and stresses within the body politic was the greatest contribution that could be made towards the creation of a stable new Asia.

Liaquat Ali Khan's important assertions manifested in the topic of the speech text represent various meanings from sociopolitical and religious perspective. The interpretation reveals an underlying justification regarding the division of India on sociopolitical and religious differences. The implied meaning further identifies an acute negation of enlightenment, peace, brotherhood, and equality. It is an unjustified example of criticism and charges leveled against the opponents on religious grounds. Mostly, a number of politicians practice such sort of political discourse on a variety of occasions. This mode of criticism is well known and peculiar in culturally biased societies as the underlying speech text shows an undemocratic and intolerant attitude of the speaker towards his opponents. It is therefore considered on sociopolitical and religious grounds as a violent combat of arguments constructed to disgrace the opponents.

3.9. Super Structures: Text Schemata

Van Dijk (1998) defines text schema as a logical sequence of arguments presented in the discourse of a text. In this speech text, Liaquat Ali Khan argues a number of sociopolitical and religious issues faced by the Muslims of the subcontinent. His position as a Prime Minister plays the main part on account of the political and religious arguments manipulated to influence the audience. He tries to convince them on the basis of a political ideology behind the demand and need for a separate country for the Muslims in India which still remains controversial with the parts like Kashmir. However, considering the topic 'Pakistan and the Modern World', it requires a direct address to the problems faced, and the speaker using the platform goes on convincing the audience on political ideology of two nation theory which is difficult to prove and justify till today.

Looking at the levels and justification of arguments, Liaquat Ali Khan severely condemns opponents on the basis of cultural and ideological patterns of life. There are personal opinions showing criticism on account of faith and belief being practiced by the people in Hinduism. The underlying differences between two faiths need further clarification on the part of a speaker to convince the audience regarding the assertions in the speech text.

He also argues that the development of Pakistan largely depends upon the help and support from the West in the field of science and technology. There are limited resources of economy and agriculture that need an immediate attention to be enhanced at the grass-root level. He intentionally utters these issues in the mode of an argument to seek help from the Western World. The speaker tries to convince the audience on the synthesis of faith and science. He also moves on the meaning of the word freedom in the modern world giving it positive impression. However, there are immediate shifts, such as the contrast of living standards between East and West with a threatening note and blaming West for this backwardness.

4. Conclusion

CDA aims to analyze communication in a sociopolitical and cultural context. There have been a variety of meaningful approaches to analyze any forms of a text or talk embodying discourse, such as conversation analysis, narrative analysis, rhetoric/stylistics, and media analysis. The underlying critical study was based on a political speech delivered by Liaquat Ali Khan at the University of Kansas, United States of America. It was mainly pursued to discover how the language of a politician pursues people in the enactment of power dominance, inequality, and the imposition of an ideology.

This study followed van Dijk's (1993) socio-cognitive model to highlight the important aspects of discourse production and comprehension. He collectively considers discourse as a matter of mental representation of knowledge and overall experience of the world forming a belief, attitude, and ideology. He also calls it as an abstract depiction of mind or a personal and social cognition based on participants' observation and interaction with the world phenomenon. van Dijk attaches importance to the role of context in developing, framing, organizing, and understanding the appropriate meaning of discourse. Its underlying objective in the construction of an ideology is completely based on sociocultural and political context. A large number of such political and rhetorical discourses have implications on producing wrong agenda to influence their audience (1993, p. 257).

Finally, the meaningful insights drawn from the critical analysis of an underlying speech text highlight the enactment of power dominance, ideology, and inequality. The context, access, and the participant's position entitle him to influence the audience through a persuasive style of discourse. Thus, the hidden agenda of the speech text was to justify the separation of United India on sociopolitical and religious grounds.

References

- [1] Behnam, B. & Kazemian, B. (2013). A comparative study of ideational grammatical metaphor in scientific and political texts. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics and Discourse Analysis*, 1(1), 40-70.

- [2] Choi, Y.A., 2006. Discourse analysis: A linguistic study of the French press's representation of the political crisis in Tahiti (2004-2005) - In *le figaro, le monde and la liberation* (master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/handle/10092/885>
- [3] Ehineni, T.O., 2014. A critical discourse analysis of modals in Nigerian political manifestos. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(3): 109-117. doi:10.5296/ijl.v6i3.5589.
- [4] Fowler, R. & B. Hodge. (1979). *Critical Linguistics*. In R. Fowler et al (Eds.). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Keegan Paul. pp. 185-213.
- [5] Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- [6] Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [7] Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- [8] Kazemian, B., Behnam, B., & Ghafoori, N. (2013). Ideational grammatical metaphor in scientific texts: a Hallidayan perspective. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(4), 146-168. ISSN 1948-5425. Macrothink institute. DOI:10.5296/ijl.v5i4.4192.
- [9] Kazemian, B., & Hashemi, S. (2014a). Nominalizations in scientific and political genres: A systemic functional linguistics perspective. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IJHSS)*, 3(2), 211-228.
- [10] Kazemian, B. & Hashemi, S., (2014b). Critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's 2012 speeches: Views from systemic functional linguistics and rhetoric. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(6): 1178-1187. doi:10.4304/tpls.4.6.1178-1187.
- [11] Kazemian, B., & Hashemi, S. (2015). *A Radical Shift to a Profound and Rigorous Investigation in Political Discourse: An Integrated Approach*. in press.
- [12] Noor, M., Ali, M., Muhabat, F. & Kazemian, B. (2015). Systemic Functional Linguistics Mood Analysis of the Last Address of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). *International Journal of Language and Linguistics. Special Issue: Critical Discourse Analysis, Rhetoric, and Grammatical Metaphor in Political and Advertisement Discourses*. 3(5-1), 1-9. DOI: 10.11648/j.ijll.s.2015030501.11
- [13] Pu, C., 2007. Discourse analysis of President Bush's speech at Tsinghua University, China. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, XVI(1): 205-219. <http://www.uri.edu/iaics/journal/index.php>
- [14] Rashidi, N. & Souzandehfar, M., 2010. A critical discourse analysis of the debates between republicans and democrats over the continuation of war in Iraq. *JoLIE* (3): 55-82- <http://www.uab.ro/cercetare/ciel/jolie/>
- [15] van, Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis*. *Discourse & Society*: 4, 249-283. London: Newbury Park.
- [16] van, Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Study*. London: Newbury Park.
- [17] Wang, J., 2010. A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama's Speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3): 254-261. doi:10.4304/jltr.1.3.254-261.
- [18] Wodak, R. & Mayer, M. (2001a). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- [19] Wodak, R. (2001b). *The Discourse of Historical Approach*. In *Methods of CDA*. (ed.). by R. Wodak & M. Meyers. London: Sage Publication, 63-94.
- [20] Zheng, S., 2014. A critical discourse analysis of financial remarks: A case study. *International Journal of English Linguistics*; 4(5): 105-116. doi:10.5539/ijel.v4n5p105.